REMARKS

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated April 4, 2008, the shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 4, 2008. Accordingly, this response is timely. In the event that the Commissioner determines that an extension of time is required, the undersigned hereby petitions for any such extension of time, and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the Milbank deposit account 13-3250 for any required fee.

I. Status of the Claims

Please amend claims 12, 21, 22, 23, 24, 42, 52, 53, 54 and 87, as indicated above. Claims 1-11, 16, 20, 25-41, 44-45, 51, 58-86, and 90-92 were previously cancelled without prejudice. Claims 12-15, 17-19, 21-24, 42, 43, 46-50, 52-57 and 87-89 are now pending in the application. Pending claims 12, 21, 22, 23, 24, 42, 52, 53, 54 and 87 are independent claims.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-15, 17-19, 21-24, 42, 43, 46-50, 52-57 and 87-89 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that the "parity divisor" has a mathematically impossible relationship, namely the divisor of zero, and also that the meaning of "parity divisor" in the industry is in conflict and would have been confused.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-15, 17-19, 21-24, 42, 43, 46-50, 52-57 and 87-89 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite, again with respect to the term "parity divisor."

One of the Examiner's arguments appears to be that "parity divisor" has a well known or ordinary meaning in the financial community, but the use of "parity divisor" in the

pending claims does not conform to that meaning. In fact, the Examiner states that Applicant's use is "repugnant" to the meaning of the language. The Examiner also states that a parity divisor of zero has a mathematically impossible relationship because the product is infinity. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position, and traverse the rejection.

While the Examiner may be correct that the root of parity is par, it is clear from review of a number of dictionaries that root is the Latin par, which represents equal, not a modern usage of par as provided in the context of Barron's Dictionary of Finance. Certainly the word par in Latin had a meaning long before par came to be used to describe "an assigned amount used to compute the dollar accounting value." Regardless, the term in question in the claims is "parity divisor" not par, or parity.

The Examiner has pointed to instances of usage of the term parity and then contends that Applicant's use of "parity divisor" in the claims is not consistent. Applicant submits that the proper question is whether "parity divisor" has a meaning that is well understood and whether Applicant's use is so different from that meaning as to be "repugnant." Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not pointed to a single use of the term "parity divisor" in support of the rejection, but instead relies on usage of "parity" and "divisor." That is improper.

While not an absolute measure of usage, a search at www.google.com for the term "parity divisor" revealed about 30 matches or hits. Those search results are attached. Such a small number of matches tends to indicate that the term "parity divisor" is not particularly common. Further, review of the specific matches reveals that a majority (about 16 matches) are actually in the context of NYSE usage, and some of those uses are directly related to this pending patent application or related patent applications. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's position,

Applicant's use of the term "parity divisor" in the claims appears to be the most common and consistent use of the term. There is no other common usage. Because Applicants' usage is actually the most common usage, it by definition can not be "repugnant."

With respect to the Examiner's statement that a divisor of zero is mathematically impossible, a simple review of the specification reveals that circumstance is actually well explained. "In one embodiment, there are six options for the parity divisor, ranging from zero (0) to five (5). They are 0) crowd only, no display book ..." (page 23, lines 16-17). "For each automatic execution, the quantity allocated to the display book is determined by the following formula, as long as the divisor is greater than zero." (emphasis added, page 23, lines 22-23). "Of course, when the parity divisor is zero (0), the amount allocated to display book is zero." (emphasis added, page 24, lines 7-8). Thus, a parity divisor of zero is actually fully addressed in the specification, and therefore not a mathematically impossible relationship.

Review of the specification (*see e.g.*, page 23, line 8 - page 24, line 17) reveals that the meaning of the term "parity divisor" is well explained in the application. Thus, because the term "parity divisor" is well described in the specification and that meaning and use is consistent in the claims, the claim's use of the term "parity divisor" is not "repugnant."

Applicants' submit that the rejections as to § 112 ¶¶ 1 and 2 are unsupported and improper and ask that they be withdrawn. However, to avoid further § 112 rejections on this term and advance the claims to allowance, the claims have been amended to remove the allegedly "repugnant" term. Instead, the claims now recite "an allocation option." A non-limiting example of support for use of that term is found at page 23, lines 10-12, where the specification clearly describes allocation and describes six options for allocation. One of the described options is all crowd, another option is all book and the other four options are various percentage allocations to

both crowd and book. Thus, no new matter is introduced by the amendment.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The rejection and particular references relied on for individual claims is somewhat confusing in the Office Action, but it appears that at least for independent claims 12, 21, 22, 23, 24, 42, 52, 53 and 54 the Examiner is relying on a combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,270 to *Cristofich*, what the Examiner characterizes as applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) and a speech by SEC Commissioner Glassman ("*Glassman*") in rejecting the claims as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). For claim 87, the Examiner appears to be relying on the combination of *Cristofich*, AAPA, *Glassman*, and *Hasbrouck*.

Prior to the instant invention, for execution of round-lot orders at NYSE, an open-outcry floor-based exchange, all orders whether they were limit or market orders were exposed to the trading crowd at the post for possible price improvement. This was in keeping with the specialist duty to execute orders at the best possible price. A way to ensure the best execution price included exposure of the order on the auction floor for possible price improvement. This is explained in the specification. (page 1, lines 16-24).

In fact, *Hasbrouck*, which is one of the references relied on by the Examiner in rejecting some of the pending claims, specifically describes this, stating: "Because the NYSE specialist must expose market orders to the crowd and does not automatically execute them against the posted quote, 'price improvement' is possible: market orders may be executed at better than the quoted price and limit orders may be executed at better than the limit price." *Hasbrouck*, page 13, last paragraph.

Prior to the instant invention there were also non-floor-based electronic exchanges, NASDAQ being one example. But, without an auction floor at an electronic

exchange there was no crowd at a trading post where an order could be exposed for possible price improvement. Instead, non-floor-based electronic exchanges typically had multiple market makers who individually posted their respective bids and offers, which together produced a best bid and best offer. On such a non-floor-based electronic exchange, when the system received a market order it was automatically executed against the best bid or offer. The posted bid or offer was the execution price and the order could execute up to the posted size of the respective bid or offer. Similarly, when such a non-floor-based electronic exchange received a limit order, if the price was such that it could execute against the best bid or offer (*i.e.*, it was a marketable limit order), then the limit order executed at that best bid or offer price, again up to the posted size of the best bid or offer. If the limit order was not marketable (*e.g.*, not priced so it could immediately execute), it was simply added to an order book, similar to the market maker bids and offers. For the non-floor-based electronic exchanges, there was no price improvement where an order was exposed to a crowd and the execution price could be improved to something that was better than the published bid/offer.

Thus, the Examiner's assertion is wrong on page 7 where he states that: "The price of the limit order would be the same with or without Applicant's invention. If the specialist has offers in hand which are equal to or better than the customer's limit price and if the other parameters of the customer's order are satisfied in all respects the order will execute without going to the floor." Without the instant invention, a round-lot limit order presented for execution at NYSE, a floor-based exchange, was always exposed to the auction market crowd for possible price improvement. There was no automatic execution against the orders that the specialist had in hand. Execution of a round-lot order against orders that the specialist might hold was only after exposure of the limit order to the auction crowd for possible price improvement, and if no

price improvement was offered by the crowd, then the specialist could fill the order from limit orders on the display book or from his/her own holdings, acting as the specialist in that security.

It is only with the applicant's invention that a limit order can automatically execute against orders that the specialist may have in hand (*e.g.*, orders that are on the book and constitute the best bid/offer), without exposure to the trading floor for possible price improvement. In fact, the Examiner has acknowledged that with a fiduciary duty, the specialist was obligated to try to get the best execution price for all orders. This meant that at NYSE, which was a floor-based auction market, the only way to ensure the best price was by exposing the order to the crowd for possible price improvement. Without the instant invention it might have been a violation of the specialist's fiduciary duty to automatically execute a limit order against orders that the specialist had in hand, without exposing the order to the auction crowd for possible price improvement.

The instant invention provides a change in the way an order can execute, and the designation of the order for automatic execution ("NX"), serves as a waiver of the specialist's fiduciary duty to obtain the best execution price with respect to that particular order. By designating an order for automatic execution in the instant invention, the specialist is informed that instead of exposing the order to the crowd for possible price improvement, an immediate and automatic execution at a particular price (the best bid/offer) is preferred, and in fact demanded.

Turning to the references cited in the rejections. *Cristofich* was filed in 1997, and may date back through continuations and continuations-in-part to 1992. One particular section of *Cristofich* that is relied on by the Examiner (col. 9, lines 15-20) states: "The system then accesses the current quote … accessed the current quote for the specified security, … and compares this price data … If the comparison criteria is met, … the system links to an exchange

for automatic execution of the options exercised." *Cristofich* does not say how the automatic execution is performed, only that the system links to an exchange for automatic execution. Thus, any automatic execution described in *Cristofich* is limited to "automatic execution" of the options as available on exchanges existing in 1997 or possibly earlier.

For options exchanges, Applicants know there were floor-based options exchanges in 1997, such as the Chicago Board Options Exchange ("CBOE"). Applicants also know that the International Securities Exchange ("ISE") is a non-floor-based "automated" options exchange, and that ISE began trading operations in mid-2000. Applicants also know that at some time after mid-2000, CBOE developed a hybrid system that offered both traditional floor-based trading and "automated" trading. However, prior to the beginning of trading operations by ISE in mid-2000, Applicants are not aware of any "automated" options exchanges in the prior art, or in particular, any options exchanges where orders were executed during regular trading hours without exposure to a floor-based trading crowd. Thus, the statement relied on in *Cristofich* regarding "automatic execution of the options exercised" does not support an "automatic" execution in the sense that an automatic execution is done without exposure to a trading crowd for possible price improvement, because there is no evidence that such an "automatic" execution as described in *Cristofich* was even possible in 1997.

At most, *Cristofich* discloses making a comparison to a quote price for a security and if the comparison is favorable, then sending an order to an options exchange for execution. Although *Cristofich* describes that as an "automatic execution" there is no evidence to show that the described "automatic execution" was done without exposing the order on the trading floor of the existing floor-based options exchanges for possible price improvement, because there is no evidence that any of the existing options exchanges offered such an automatic execution feature.

In fact, automatic execution without exposing for possible price improvement on the options trading floor may have violated a fiduciary duty to obtain the best price, which the Examiner relies heavily on in the rejection. Further, there is absolutely nothing in *Cristofich* that shows a split path for execution, where one path is exposing the order for possible price improvement if the securities order does not include an indicator requesting automatic execution, and the other path is automatically executing at least a portion of the order at a quote price, without exposing the order for possible price improvement, if the securities order includes an indicator requesting automatic execution.

There is also nothing in *Cristofich* that discloses or suggests an allocation option, where the option is selected from the group of crowd only, book only, or percentage to crowd and percentage to book. This is because *Cristofich* discloses nothing about the actual execution, or post-execution process. *Cristofich* says merely "the system links to an exchange for automatic execution of the options exercised."

Further, *Cristofich* says nothing about the claimed order for the steps, where the allocation option is assigned before a securities order is received, then after the order is executed, the order is automatically allocated among contra parties according to the assigned allocation option. This particular ordering is important to the invention because it allows the allocation option to be pre-set before orders are received. Being pre-set means no input is required as to the assigned allocation option once an order is received -- there is no need to slow the execution process down to assign an allocation option, since it is already assigned. Further, by making the execution step before the later allocation step, the order can be executed immediately and the system does not even need to determine which contra parties will participate or receive an allocation. That determination can follow the execution. These differences are in marked

contrast to a traditional floor-based open-outcry auction, where there was no pre-set allocation option that was one of the three indicated options.

In addition, there is nothing in *Cristofich* that discloses or suggests many of the other elements of the pending claims. For claim 12 in particular, *Cristofich* does not disclose or suggest the following features:

assigning an allocation option to a security, wherein the allocation option is one of three options selected from the group consisting of allocate to crowd only, allocate to book only, or allocate a percentage to crowd and allocate a percentage to book;

automatically determining whether the securities order includes an indicator requesting automatic execution;

exposing the order for possible price improvement if the securities order does not include an indicator requesting automatic execution;

automatically executing at least a portion of the order at a quote price, without exposing the order for possible price improvement, if the securities order includes an indicator requesting automatic execution;

determining the assigned allocation option; and

after automatically executing at least a portion of the order, automatically allocating shares of the automatic execution among contra parties according to the assigned allocation option.

The other independent claims (21, 22, 23, 24, 42, 52, 53, 54 and 87) recite similar features that are not found in *Cristofich*.

With respect to what the Examiner characterizes as AAPA, applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, the Examiner relies on statements in the Background. In 2000, without

the instant invention, there was not much flexibility available to investors for execution. Almost without exception, securities traded exclusively on the listing exchange. That meant an NYSE listed security was only traded at NYSE in open-outcry and necessarily all orders were presented to the auction crowd for possible price improvement. Alternatively, a NASDAQ listed security was only traded on NASDAQ and was not traded in open-outcry. Executions at NASDAQ were against the posted bid/offer, without any possible price improvement. Prior to the instant inventions, there was no ability for an investor, who wanted to trade round-lots of an NYSE listed security, to take advantage of trading at the posted bid/offer without price improvement, such as found at NASDAQ. Alternatively, an investor who wanted to trade a NASDAQ listed security could not get price improvement over the published bid/offer. That is what the statements in the background of the specification are referring to. Instead of the instant invention, a solution to those issues might have been to allow investors to trade securities on other exchanges. That would have allowed NYSE listed securities to trade on NASDAQ, offering execution against the published bid/offer, without price improvement. However, in 2000 when the priority application for this invention was filed, securities were only traded on the listing exchange. Thus, the instant invention is not an obvious result of the issues identified in the Background.

Applicants do acknowledge that in the prior art there were open-outcry exchanges, such as NYSE, and there were electronic exchanges, such as NASDAQ. However, both exchanges had been in existence for a number of years, and until the instant invention, there was no system that offered for a single security at a single exchange, both automatic execution without price improvement, and exposure for possible price improvement, where there was an ability to select the particular desired type of execution.

With respect to Commissioner Glassman's speech, the Examiner appears to rely on the speech for the proposition that broker-dealers owe a fiduciary duty to customers, and a duty to put the customer's interests first. If that were strictly the case, then at NYSE, where price improvement is available in open-outcry, the only appropriate execution would be exposure of all orders for possible price improvement. An execution performed without such exposure for price improvement would be a violation of the broker/dealer's fiduciary duty. However, exposure for price improvement is precisely what NYSE offered prior to the instant invention, and execution without price improvement is one of the features offered by the instant inventions. Thus, the speech by Commissioner Glassman actually teaches away from the instant inventions because under the instant inventions, execution at a bid/offer price without exposure for price improvement is offered. If a better price would be available in open-outcry, then the instant inventions would be contrary to the fiduciary duty described in *Glassman*. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill, considering the fiduciary duty described in *Glassman*, would not be motivated to consider a system that does not strictly provide the best possible execution price. Applicants submit that all of the claims are allowable over the cited art for the stated reasons.

Further, in order to clearly define the claimed allocation option, the claims have been amended to recite the assigned allocation option is assigned before the securities order is received, and is one of three possible options: allocate all to crowd; allocate all to book; or allocate percentage to crowd and percentage to book. There is nothing in any of the cited references that discloses or suggests such an allocation option, those three particular allocation options, or the claimed order of assigning the allocation option before receiving the securities order. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are further allowable over the cited references for these additional reasons.

The arguments above generally apply to all of the independent claims. With respect to independent claim 54, in addition to the numerous distinguishing features explained above, the claim further recites:

comparing the size of the order to a respective interest in the security if the securities order includes an indicator requesting automatic execution;

changing the status of at least a portion of the order from automatic execution to regular execution if the securities order includes an indicator requesting automatic execution and the size of the order is greater than the interest.

The Examiner does not point to any particular disclosure in *Cristofich*, AAPA, or *Glassman* for those features, but instead states "[i]t would have been obvious to change the status of an order from automatic execution to regular execution if the respective interest in the security does not meet the size of the security being offered, since no exact matching counter party offer is available for automatic execution. ... The ordinary practitioner would have seen it as obvious that the order had to be changed from automatic to regular execution." (Office Action pages 14-15)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 54 does not change the entire order from automatic to regular execution. Instead, the claim language states "changing the status of at least a portion of the order..." Then, the claim goes on to automatically execute at least a portion of the order. If the entire order were changed to regular execution, there would be nothing left for automatic execution. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's unsupported argument, the entire order is not changed from automatic to regular execution. Instead, a portion of the order is changed to regular execution, and a portion of the order is automatically executed. There is nothing obvious about doing that.

Motivation to combine references. For every one of the rejections, the Examiner's stated motivation is: "a desire to provide a data processing method and system for managing individual accounts directed to the transacting of securities transactions with pre-established criteria." The Examiner points to *Cristofich* (col. 2, lines 29-33) as support.

Respectfully, that stated motivation bears absolutely no relevance to the pending claims or anything else of relevance to the instant inventions. The stated motivation is meaningless as a motivation for implementing any change or combining any of the cited references. The stated motivation to combine is unsupported, it is improper, and it is simply a part of a sentence that the Examiner has extracted and modified from *Cristofich* in an effort to justify the hind-sight reconstruction of the claims from multiple pieces of prior art that individually and in combination fails to show all of the elements of the claims.

Finally, the Examiner seems to make arguments that Applicants have conceded certain points because they were not re-stated verbatim from prior responses, or because they were not argued at length in the responses. Applicants have made arguments on points of distinction that are believed to be the most significant between the cited references and the pending claims. However, one incorrect argument in particular by the Examiner found at page 22 of the Office Action merits a response. The Examiner states: "Applicant has conceded the various portions of *Cristofich* used in the rejections which he has not traversed as prior art ... automatically determining whether the securities order includes includes [sic] an indicator requesting automatic execution; exposing the order for possible price improvement if the securities order does not include an indicator requesting automatic execution." (Office Action at page 22). There was and is no such concession. *Cristofich* discloses at most "link[ing] to an exchange for automatic execution of the options exercised." (col. 9, lines 15-20). *Cristofich*

describes that is an "automatic execution" but as explained above, in 1997 there were no options exchanges that offered automatic execution. Thus, there is nothing in *Cristofich* that teaches or suggests "determining whether the securities order includes an indicator requesting automatic execution."

With respect to "exposing the order for possible price improvement if the order does not include an indicator requesting automatic execution." This is like a Catch-22. Options exchanges at the time of *Cristofich* offered price improvement for every order because they were floor-based open-outcry exchanges, there was no "automatic execution." Thus, options orders were exposed for price improvement. Thus, if *Cristofich* linked to and sent orders to options exchanges, then they were necessarily exposed for price improvement. However, *Cristofich* says the order was sent for automatic execution to the options exchange, which makes no sense because automatic execution was not available. Further, in *Cristofich* there is only one path, send to an exchange for execution. There is nothing in *Cristofich* about two paths: automatic execution or exposure for possible price improvement. The Examiner's rejection in this regard makes no sense and Applicants have not conceded that the *Cristofich* reference discloses those features.

III. Request for Reconsideration

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP

Chris L. Holm
Reg. No.: 39,227

July 30, 2008

Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)

LA1:#6381392

Web Images Maps News Shopping Gmail more ▾ Sign in

Google

"parity divisor" Search Advanced Search Preferences

Web Results **1** - **10** of about **33** for **"parity divisor"**. (**0.21** seconds)

FR Doc E8-11808
Under the proposed rule change, passively converted CAP orders would become their own parity group for purposes of the **parity divisor**. ...
edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/E8-11808.htm - 25k - Cached - Similar pages

[PDF] Federal Register /Vol. 73, No. 102/Tuesday, May 27, 2008/Notices
File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - View as HTML
purposes of the **parity divisor**. For. example, in the execution described .... Thus, the **parity divisor** is. being increased by one, though only on ...
edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/pdf/E8-11808.pdf - Similar pages

[PDF] Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule ...
File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - View as HTML
would become their own parity group for purposes of the **parity divisor**. For example, in the ... Thus, the **parity divisor** is being increased by one, ...
www.sec.gov/rules/sro/nyse/2008/34-57845.pdf - Similar pages

(WO/2002/015461) METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AUTOMATIC EXECUTION OF A ...
... a **parity divisor**; and executing the securities transaction, wherein a contra side for the transaction is selected according to the **parity divisor**. ...
www.wipo.int/pctdb/en/wo.jsp?IA=US2001025968&DISPLAY=CLAIMS - 55k -
Cached - Similar pages

(WO/2002/015461) METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AUTOMATIC EXECUTION OF A ...
A **parity divisor** is determined and the securities transaction is executed, with a contra side for the transaction selected according to the **parity divisor**. ...
www.wipo.int/pctdb/en/wo.jsp?IA=US2001025968&DISPLAY=DESC - 167k -
Cached - Similar pages

AIG VALIC Industry News Provided by NewsEdge
Under the proposed rule change, passively converted CAP orders would become their own parity group for purposes of the **parity divisor**. ...
dialog.newsedge.com/portal.asp?site=20071008144431055932258&
searchfolderid=pg20071008145222097593333... - 42k - Cached - Similar pages

[PDF] 30436 A Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 102 Tuesday, May 27, 2008
File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - View as HTML
purposes of the **parity divisor**. For. example, in the execution described .... Thus, the **parity divisor** is. being increased by one, though only on ...
www.smartpdf.com/register/2008/may/27/30436A.pdf - Similar pages

Federal Register: NOTICES Self-Regulatory Organizations; Proposed ...
Under the proposed rule change, passively converted CAP orders would become their own parity group for purposes of the **parity divisor**. ...
www.thefederalregister.com/d.p/2008-05-27-E8-11808 - 54k - Cached - Similar pages

Self-Regulatory Organizations; the New York Stock Exchange LLC ...
Under the proposed rule change, passively converted CAP orders would become their own parity group for purposes of the **parity divisor**. ...
www.tradingmarkets.com/.site/news/Stock%20News/1610536/ - 76k -

Cached - Similar pages

[PDF] 30436 A Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 102 Tuesday, May 27, 2008
File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - View as HTML
purposes of the **parity divisor**. For. example, in the execution described .... Thus, the **parity divisor** is. being increased by one, though only on ...
www.setonresourcecenter.com/register/2008/may/27/30436A.pdf - Similar pages

"parity divisor" Search

Search within results | Language Tools | Search Tips | Dissatisfied? Help us improve | Try Google Experimental

Linear Symmetric Determinantal Hypersurfaces
basis given by the vertices of the graph G. The **parity divisor** D ... is the **parity divisor**. of G. Proof. In Urabe's correspondence between the lattices and ...
projecteuclid.org/.../1.0/Disseminate?handle=euclid.mmj/1144437441&view=body&content-type=pdf_1 - Similar pages

(WO/2002/015461) METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AUTOMATIC EXECUTION OF A ...
A **parity divisor** is determined and the securities transaction is executed, with a contra side for the transaction selected according to the **parity divisor**. ...
www.wipo.int/pctdb/en/wo.jsp?IA=WO2002015461&DISPLAY=DESC - 167k - Cached - Similar pages

Pharma Live Search
... they are either elected or converted. ... group" was treated as a single agent in the **parity divisor**. Thus for example in an execution involving two . ...
www.pharmalivesearch.com/PhL/EUISearch.do?&q=medical+record&qgeneral=medical+record&st=0&... - 55k - Cached - Similar pages

[APPLICATION] U.S. Patent 9929886 - Google Patents Result
US Pat. App 9/929,886
[0094] The **parity divisor** is used by system 100 to determine how to allocate an NX ...
Each stock in a display book has its own **parity divisor** settings. ...
www.google.com/patents?id=sMmDAAAAEBAJ

Macro*World Investor
Under the proposed rule change, passively converted CAP orders would become their own parity group for purposes of the **parity divisor**. ...
www.mworld.com/m/m.w?lp=GetStory&id=307934231 - 42k - Cached - Similar pages

[PDF] Linear Symmetric Determinantal Hypersurfaces
File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - View as HTML
Linear Symmetric Determinantal Hypersurfaces. Jens Piontkowski. January 24, 2005. The question which equations of hypersurfaces in the complex projective ...
www.math.uni-duesseldorf.de/~piontkow/det.pdf - Similar pages

[APPLICATION] U.S. Patent 9929886 - Google Patents Result
US Pat. App 9/929,886
... a **parity divisor**; and executing the securities transaction, wherein a contra side for the transaction is selected according to the **parity divisor**. 79. ...
www.google.com/patents?id=sMmDAAAAEBAJ

Zeisel number - explanation-Guide.info
Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest... → read in the encylopedia. Find more facts ...
explanation-guide.info/meaning/Zeisel-number.html - 17k - Cached - Similar pages

Compactified Jacobians and Symmetric Determinantal Hypersurfaces

Compactified Jacobians. and. Symmetric Determinantal. Hypersurfaces. Habilitationsschrift. fur das Fach Mathematik. der Mathematisch–Naturwissenschaftlichen ...

deposit.ddb.de/cgi-bin/dokserv?idn=973256419&
dok_var=d1&dok_ext=pdf&filename=973256419.pdf - Similar pages

[APPLICATION] U.S. Patent 9929886 - Google Patents Result
US Pat. App 9/929,886
[0258] The **parity divisor** on the offer side is temporarily zero because short ... (In this example, the give up is NX, not LMT because the **parity divisor** on ...
www.google.com/patents?id=sMmDAAAAEBAJ

Previous 1 **2** 3 **Next**

"parity divisor" Search

Web Images Maps News Shopping Gmail more ▾ Sign in

Google

"parity divisor" Search Advanced Search Preferences

Web Books Results **21** - **29** of **29** for "**parity divisor**". (**0.12** seconds)

Lucky Numbers - explanation-Guide.info
Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest ... 13, Kylie (album). number 53. Track listing "I Should Be ...
explanation-guide.info/meaning/Lucky-Numbers.html - 20k - Cached - Similar pages

Heteromecic number - explanation-Guide.info
Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest ... 6, Numbers. Numbers can mean: Number Book of Numbers . ...
explanation-guide.info/meaning/Heteromecic-number.html - 20k - Cached - Similar pages

Amicable numbers - explanation-Guide.info
Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest ... 13, Mark Evanier. writer Dennis Palumbo, since young ...
explanation-guide.info/meaning/Amicable-numbers.html - 21k - Cached - Similar pages

Stinespring factorization theorem - explanation-Guide.info
Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest ... 13, Fermat's theorem. The 17th century mathematician ...
explanation-guide.info/meaning/Stinespring-factorization-theorem.html - 20k - Cached - Similar pages

[APPLICATION] U.S. Patent 9929886 - Google Patents Result
US Pat. App 9/929,886
Whenever there is insufficient stock on the book, the remaining balance is real names, even though the **parity divisor** is one. [0311] For contra execution ...
www.google.com/patents?id=sMmDAAAAEBAJ

Theory of numbers [Definition]
Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest common divisor Least common multiple Euclidean algorithm ...
www.wikimirror.com/Theory_of_numbers - 135k - Cached - Similar pages

Effective_results_in_number_theory - Info and Guide.
... numbers 13 Recreational topics Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest common divisor Least common ...
pheeds.com/Effective_results_in_number_theory.html - 22k - Cached - Similar pages

Probable Recreation
... numbers 13 Recreational topics Factors Composite number Highly composite number Even and odd numbers **Parity Divisor** Greatest common divisor Least common ...
www.wncwabash.com/95/69.html - 14k - Cached - Similar pages

8250 UART Programming Computers & Technology Programming
... read only register, hardware flow control, data bits **parity, divisor** latch high, fifo control register, bit data bits, receive buffer register, ...
www.panload.com/page/2666-8250-UART-Programming - 129k - Cached - Similar pages

Previous 1 2 **3**

"parity divisor" Search

Search within results | Language Tools | Search Tips | Try Google Experimental